

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
ABINGDON DIVISION

APR - 2 2019

JULIA C. DUDLEY, CLERK
BY: *A. Rose*
DEPUTY CLERK

WILLIAM LEE GRANT II,)
Plaintiff,) Case No. 1:19CV 13
v.)

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,)
Defendant.)

WILLIAM LEE GRANT II,)
Plaintiff,) Case No. 1:19CV 14
v.)

GREGORY K. HARRIS, ET AL.,)
Defendants.)

WILLIAM LEE GRANT II,)
Plaintiff,) Case No. 1:19CV 15
v.)

GREGORY K. HARRIS, ET AL.,)
Defendants.)

OPINION AND ORDER

William Lee Grant II, Springfield, Virginia, Pro Se Plaintiff.

The plaintiff has submitted applications to proceed in forma pauperis in order to file three separate civil actions. I will grant the applications but dismiss the complaints *sua sponte* as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

While I must consider pro se filings liberally, the present complaints state no recognizable causes of action and instead “describ[e] fantastic or delusional scenarios, claims with which federal district judges are all too familiar.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). To quote one recent federal court decision: “Plaintiff is a serial filer of frivolous litigation in various federal courts across the country, the vast majority of [P]laintiff’s cases [of which the Court is aware] have been dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).” *Grant v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, No. 4:18-CV-00444-ALM-CAN, 2019 WL 1009408, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 28, 2019), *R. & R. adopted*, No. 4:18-CV-444, 2019 WL 1003641 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 1, 2019) (quoting *Grant v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, No. 1:18-cv-00457-TSE-TCB (E.D. Va. May 1, 2018), *appeal dismissed as frivolous*, *Grant v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, 740 F. App’x 333 (4th Cir. 2018) (unpublished)).

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the motions to proceed in forma pauperis are GRANTED, and the Complaints are DISMISSED.

The Clerk shall close the cases.

ENTER: April 2, 2019

/s/ James P. Jones

United States District Judge